DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 153 SO 019 812

AUTHOR Wangermee, Robert; And Others
TITLE Appraisal of Cultural Policies: An Experimental Programme.
INSTITUTION Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France). Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport, Documentation Section.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 10p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
JOURNAL CIT Cultural Policy: News Report from the Council of Europe; n1-2 1988

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Area Studies; *Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Awareness; Culture Contact; European History; Foreign Countries; *Government Role; *Intercultural Communication; Western Civilization
IDENTIFIERS Europe; *European Community; *France

ABSTRACT

A comparative evaluation program of the national cultural policies of European countries was proposed by the Council of Europe in 1985 with a view toward enhanced cooperative action in European cultural policies. These national reviews are comprised of four stages: (1) the preparation of a report by each country with regards to creation, decentralization, and diversification of the target populations; (2) an examination of that survey by an international panel of experts; (3) a meeting of that panel and the chief official responsible for culture; and (4) a dissemination of those findings. This document includes excerpts from a French report which begins with the cultural policies of the Fifth Republic (1966-1970) and includes discussion of the objectives of French cultural policy, how that policy is planned, the role of the Ministry of Culture, Parliament, an assessment of the effectiveness of those policy measures, and the comments by the panel of experts. A news section on recent meetings in Europe on cultural issues follows. (PPB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306153

APPRAISAL OF CULTURAL POLICIES: AN EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMME

by

Robert Wangermee and Others

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. GERMAN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

30 019 812

Director of Education
Culture and Sport
Council of Europe
67006 Strasbourg-Cedex, France

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Nº 1-2/88 NEWS REPORT FROM THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE ISNN: 0252-0869

CULTURAL POLICY

DOSSIER

APPRAISAL OF CULTURAL POLICIES – AN EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMME

A comparative evaluation programme of the cultural policies of the European countries was proposed by the Council of Europe in 1985.

Why an undertaking of this kind? In the first place, on the eve of a unified Europe, just over the horizon, an appraisal of cultural programmes presents no doubt an interest. National cultural policy reviews would no doubt give a useful insight to problems of the major areas in the arts and help to plan the economic and political development of cultural matters. Also, there was a long-standing need for some reflection on priorities and programmes before embarking on new operations.

The idea of carrying out reviews of national cultural policies originated in the implementation by the OECD of similar exercises in the field of education, most of which had covered the policies as a whole, though some had focused on important points or necessary reforms.

This work had dealt with a well structured field, where it was possible to make a fairly comprehensive assessment of the effects of policies.

In the field of cultural policies, very different matters were at stake, with no scope for "scientific" evaluation, since the data required for this (statistics, indicators) were inadequate, and indeed often non-existent. So the purpose would very much be to learn and understand from a common standpoint, with a view to improving concerted action in European cultural policies on as objective a basis as possible. Review of cultural policies would thus concentrate on the (explicit or implicit) objectives of the authorities, the means employed to achieve them, and on the concrete results.

The experimental phase comprises four stages:

- **— preparation by each country of a report on the different aspects of its cultural policy with regard to three major themes: creation, decentralisation and diversification of the target population;**
- **— a "cross-examination" survey by a high-level international panel of experts;**
- **— a meeting of the international panel of experts and the Minister responsible for Culture;**
- **— summing-up and wide dissemination of the conclusions in an official report.**

France and Sweden offered to act as testing grounds for the cultural policy appraisal studies; they may be followed by Spain, Austria and Turkey who also expressed a keen interest in this exercise.

The first national cultural review concerned France and this study was completed at the beginning of this year.

As a first step, a national report to control and assess the implementation of cultural policy since the beginning of the Fifth Republic (1966–1970) was prepared by Mr Bernard Gournay, Professor at the Institut des Etudes Politiques and Senior Advisor to the Audit Office.

The second stage of this experimental programme consisted of a series of interviews conducted by a panel of European experts: Frédéric Dubois, Carl-Johan Kleberg, John Myerscough and Robert Wangermée, the report of which was drawn by Robert Wangermée, Administrateur Général Honoraire to the R.T.B.F., Belgium.

This second document, containing an important descriptive part, analyses in five chapters the mechanisms of and the actors on the French cultural scene: the aims of the French cultural policy; the means used to implement cultural policy; decentralising cultural activities and responsibilities; the conditions of creation, questions to the Minister of Culture and Communication.

Under the headings "Comments by the panel of experts" and "Questions to the Minister" at the end of each chapter, the report raises a series of matters for discussion which do not only concern the situation in France but apply in a similar or analogous manner to each of the European countries.

In order to familiarize our readers with this report, we publish in this issue of *Cultural Policy* some extracts from the very beginning of this voluminous report.

The scope of the study

The subject under study is cultural *policy as practised by the national authorities* (it being understood that the action of local authorities is taken into account insofar as it relates to central government action). In France cultural policy only came into its own in 1959, when André Malraux became France's first Minister in charge of cultural affairs. There was no need for the purposes of this report to carry out an exhaustive historic survey, but in order to appreciate current and recent policy, it does help to realize what features of cultural policy have remained constant over the years and what variations and innovations have taken place.

The retrospective covers a complete historic period: the 5th Republic (1959). But in recent years major political changes have left their mark on cultural policy. In May 1981 François Mitterand became President of the Republic and a left-wing government was elected. It remained in power, with some modifications, until the March 1986 elections, which returned a Centre government to power, with a liberal approach to cultural policy. Both tendencies were represented by brilliant, charismatic figures: Ministers of Culture Jack Lang and François Léotard.

Even if policy modifications are less sweeping in practice than in political speeches, and even if the overall long-term trend is one of continuity, the alternation of political power has made the study of cultural policy more complex.

The French case

Consistent political objectives

Appraising cultural policy means establishing exactly what objectives are being pursued, analysing the methods used to achieve them in terms of concrete projects, and studying the results actually achieved.

It is easy to appreciate the **general aims** of cultural policy. From the outset the idea in France was to preserve the cultural heritage, to disseminate culture as widely as possible, through decentralisation, for example, and to encourage creation. But these aims take on different hues, depending on the general political environment and the persons in charge; new projects and actions are constantly being introduced.

It is clearly not the task of the experts to judge the various hues which colour cultural policy, but rather to assess the consistency or the variations in the objectives pursued. There are clear documents to help them in their task: reports by planning commissions, sections on culture in government plans, statements by Ministers presenting their budgets to Parliament, other statements or announcements concerning new bills or projects, progress reports, which often summarise what action has been taken and what features should be corrected, continued or introduced.

Means used and measurable effects, to be interpreted judiciously

Analaysis of the *means used* to achieve goals or carry out actions must take into account not only budgets but also technical means, infrastructures and manpower. There are statistics which show how budget appropriations are distributed amongst the different sectors (music, theatre, etc), amongst major institutions and smaller associations, by function (training, creation, dissemination, conservation), geographically (Paris, the provinces, cities, towns, countryside); and the different courses of action of the Ministry can also be analysed: direct management of certain sectors, strategies and mechanisms behind agreements with various partners such as local authorities (towns, departments, regions), other ministries, private sponsors, as well as laws, decrees and regulations governing certain sectors.

Where the *decentralisation* process is concerned there are ample figures allowing us to calculate the spread of public financing between central and local government and to measure the value and nature of Ministry aid to towns, departments and regions and also the gap between Paris and the provinces or from one region to another. We can also study the development of cultural facilities in different parts of the country. **But it is not easy to draw up a satisfactory correlation between the means allocated to certain projects and the actual impact on the general public; even when such data exist, they**

are not always matched so as to give a clear picture of developments.

Furthermore, the appraisal must take the changing environment into account and refrain from drawing specific parallels between subsidies to particular institutions, equipment supplied in a particular sector and the number of people affected, measured in terms of ticket sales or by opinion poll. It is true that indicators can be found, relationships established between the means deployed and the impact in terms of democratisation, and tables drawn up to illustrate them, but they should only be interpreted bearing in mind the many interference factors.

Audiences, visitors, spectators and so on cannot be judged purely in quantitative terms; they must be broken down into socio-cultural groups or in terms of their behaviour patterns. Some excellent surveys of the cultural habits of the French people have been carried out, but they date back to 1973 and 1981 and are thus of no assistance with regard to recent trends. Motivation studies on attendance at cultural sites should be extended to sectors other than the theatre (which has been the object of recent studies). The "stay-aways", those who do not take part in cultural practices, deserve particular attention in this respect.

In the field of *creation*, it is possible to situate the value and nature of aid to artists, to institutions which disseminate their works and to industries which provide an outlet for them; we can study the nature of new works presented in theatres and at concerts, the number of books published, the number of films produced and their success rate at the national and international levels, **but there is no way of measuring the quality of the works created. Until posterity pronounces judgement, we can only fall back on the arbitration of the competent authorities.**

The experts are fully aware of the caution required in any appraisal process: in stating the means deployed in pursuit of certain objectives and the divergence between the target result and the result actually achieved, they are in no way offering any critical judgement on the success or failure of the policies concerned.

Throughout their deliberations they strove to make concrete, useful comments, on the basis of which questions could subsequently be put to the Minister of Culture and Communication. The Minister's answers, together with the experts' report, will be debated at length in the Council for Cultural Co-operation. Decentralisation, creation, increasing the target population, extending the notion of culture, multi-cultural societies are problems in every country nowadays, and the are all the more difficult to solve in that decisions have to be taken in a context of budget difficulties, or even recession. **In this respect the French experience is very enlightening, for it is full of initiatives which are often ambitious in terms of the projects involved and imaginative in the methods proposed.**

The panel of experts have done their best to use their experience to draw certain comparisons with approaches and achievements in other countries. But for want of systematically comparable data, they were only able to make occasional comparisons. They hope that in describing the French experience in this first contribution to the evaluation of cultural policies at the incentive of the CDCC they will have provided useful information to those responsible for drawing up and implementing cultural policies in Europe, and that in this way they will have contributed to international co-operation in the spirit of the Council of Europe's mission.

Drawing up cultural policy

No permanent advisory body

Those responsible for cultural policy in France are not assisted by any decision-making body made up of representatives of groups from the world of culture: creators, people who run profit-making or non-profit associations, teachers, amateurs, fans, company managers, workers. Such a consultative body did exist at one stage, but only for two years, in answer to a proposal from the Cultural Commission to the 6th Plan. It was called the "Cultural Development Council" and was made up of about forty eminent personalities from artistic, university and administrative circles, under the chairmanship of the poet Pierre Emmanuel. The decree by which Prime Minister Chaban-Delmas created it in September 1971 defined it as "a body for reflection, confrontation and suggestion on the different forms of cultural action and the basic lines of government cultural policy".

This Council drew up various files and formulated some interesting opinions on television, schooling and cultural development, the interministerial Cultural Intervention Fund, poetry, but it was never really regularly consulted by the Minister and the opinions it ventured were scarcely heeded. Its members therefore felt compelled to tender their joint resignation in October 1973, without the government, which had changed in the meantime, showing the slightest sign of regret. The objectives set by the 6th Plan were discarded. The opinions of an advisory committee, which continued to draw inspiration from the Plan, seemed to encumber the Minister's work rather than alleviate it.

Since 1958, however, in another field, a very broad-based *Economic and Social Council* has existed, made up of representatives of the different social groups. This Council gives its views on issues put to it by the ministers concerned, on bills in the drafting stage or simply on matters it decides to pronounce itself on of its own accord. Before giving its opinion the Council interviews experts in the subject under study; it studies documents and statistics and summarises them in its reports; and finally it formulates suggestions or proposals to the appropriate minister or to Parliament explicitly combining the complementary views of the various member groups. The Economic and Social Council recently expressed an opinion in May 1987 based on a well-documented report on the theme "Culture and Economics"[1]. It had previously given various opinions, of its own accord or at the request of the government, on various matters related to culture: theatre, music, films, books, video[2]. Naturally enough, however, the Council only occasionally considers cultural matters, mainly because of the importance cultural industries have taken on in recent years.

Culture and the Plan

For a long time a useful role was played by the working groups or committees which helped draw up the cultural section of the five-year Plan. Since just after the war (1946) France has regulated the essential aspects of the nation's life — industry, agriculture, social affairs and education — by a series of five-year plans drawn up after concertation between politicians (or their expert advisers) and a broad spectrum of representatives from the sectors concerned, who define objectives, decide on priorities and estimate the means required to achieve their aims. Initially it was above all a question of investment planning; but the plans have not always made sufficient allowance for operating expenses and the cost of staff, which are particularly high in cultural areas.

Only as of the 4th Plan covering the period 1962–1965, and subsequent to the constitution a little earlier of an independent ministry, did culture become the object of a specific examination by a "Commission for Cultural Facilities and the Artistic Heritage", which set up working groups in different sectors made up of figures from the worlds of the social sciences, popular education, politics, etc.

The ambitions and scruples of the Plan

It was not without a pang of conscience that the planners resolved to include culture in their forecasts: as the 4th Plan says, "State intervention in cultural affairs has long been viewed with suspicion in France because of the possible sterilising effect of state control on creation and the unwarranted attempt on free choice from government interference. All the more reason to wonder whether protecting these two liberties is not incompatible with planning . . . ".

But at the same time by progressively enlarging the traditional "fine arts" notion of culture *the planners have always stressed the importance of culture for all men, beyond the mere entertainment or ostentatious luxury value, to the extent that they even (in the 1982 interim plan) made it the actual goal of economic and social development.*

The unwieldy, unpredictable side of planning

It is not important in this chapter about objectives to determine to what extent the choices and options of the different plans were actually put into practice. The government determines its choices in the context of its general policy and the means available to it under its annual budget

1) Opinion adopted by the Economic and Social Council during the session of 13 May 1987 on Culture and Economics.

2) Opinions, for example, on the development of theatrical activities (1977), the preservation of the architectural and archaeological heritage and the countryside (1979), prospects in the film industry (1979), prospects in music and lyric drama (1980), sponsorship (1982), the dissemination of culture through books and magazines (1983), French video creations (1985).

and submits them to Parliament in the form of a bill which, in principle, comprises commitments over several years. But adoption of the bill does not always guarantee that the chosen projects will actually be implemented. *Not until they have the additional backing of the programme acts or budget acts are the projects more likely to get off the ground.* The changing political climate — a change of government or of minister — can alter the course of a project, delay it or cause it to be scrapped altogether. It also transpires that certain major projects involving heavy investment and subsequent overheads are implemented without provision having been made for them in the Plan[3].

The reports by the Cultural Commissions to the different plans are not always of equal interest. They contain a certain amount of rhetoric proclaiming the importance of culture in society. They deal to varying degrees with subjects such as the cultural heritage, creation, democratisation and regionalisation. They often announce general aims, overall objectives and sometimes a wide variety of precise proposals, echoing the permanent aims of cultural policy but also the changing means deployed and the flurry of new ideas in the air at any time, some of them making a lasting impact on one project or another, while others fade as quickly as they appeared; the different proposals are not always very well matched.

In any event the Plans have been very significant, being born more often than not of a veritable "national court of culture" made up of the men in the field (managers, creators and others directly involved in cultural life), the users of cultural institutions and industries (or their spokesmen), onlookers and thinkers (specialised faculty members and researchers, often working under the guidance of the Research Department).

The 4th, 5th and 6th Plans (1962–65, 1966–70 and 1971–75 respectively) seem to have been particularly carefully prepared by specialised cultural committees; the 7th Plan (1976–80) provided for no cultural committee (but cultural projects were included in certain interministerial programmes) and the same applies to the 8th Plan (1981–85), which was cut short by the result of the presidential elections in 1981. The Interim Plan (1982–84) placed the cultural and socio-cultural factors of development amongst the top four political priorities (employment, structures, production and national solidarity). The 9th Plan (1984–88) took into account a report on "social, educational and cultural development" from a report by the "Long-term Group on Culture" (March 1983); it gave rise to two "Plan Acts" (on "strategy and major actions", July 1983, and "means of execution", December 1983), but it was partially reviewed as a result of the change of government after the March 1986 elections[4].

The marks the planners left

There is no point going into the details of the various Plans at this stage. We shall just highlight certain recurring themes and turning points.

The recurring themes feature concern for the cultural heritage (with numerous and varied suggestions), insistence on the capital role of schooling accompanied with regrets about the obstacles to the integration of art teaching into general education, the need to establish a close link between cultural action and the public radio and television stations, the wish to integrate all state cultural services in a single organisation (leading in the proposal in the 6th Plan to set up a *Cultural Development Advisory Committee*), the demand for support to encourage creation and the need to reduce cultural inequalities and democratise cultural activities.

On the subject of *democratisation*, we should point out that whereas the 4th Plan (like Malraux) advocated increasing the number of large cultural centres, the 5th Plan favoured more modest, mobile and versatile facilities suited to management at the local community level, and the 6th Plan, highlighted the role of mediators and organisers rather than institutions, arguing that it had no confidence in direct action by the state and that "cultural development relied on the recognition by the state of the vital 'relay' role played by local communities, communes and departments, works committees and cultural, youth and educational associations".

With regard to *decentralisation*, the 4th Plan introduces the first reflections on the need to reform the joint finance process between State and communes, (for teaching, museums, theatres, cultural centres, libraries, monuments) and on the appointment of Ministry of Culture delegates at the regional level; but not until 1974 were the first "cultural charters" launched, subsequently being adapted in 1982 into "cultural development conventions" with local authorities. The 6th Plan declared that no more than one-third of the Ministry of Culture budget should be spent on the Paris region and called for decentralisation to give regional cultures a means of expression befitting their authenticity at long last.

The outlines of the *Cultural Intervention Fund* were traced in the 4th Plan, but it was not to be created until 1972 following a formal proposal in the 6th Plan. The Cultural Intervention Fund is an interministerial fund (doing away with administrative partitions) set up to facilitate non-recurrent experiments in cultural development to be carried out in liaison with associations, local authorities, creators and users.

The preparatory work on the Plans reveals a certain awareness of failure in cultural democratisation policies and strategies: whatever measures are taken, large groups of the population remain impervious to high culture.

Doubtless under the shock of the May 1968 crisis and the auspices of the "New Society" announced by Prime Minister Chaban-Delmas, the 6th Plan declared somewhat lyrically: "it is not merely a matter of increasing knowledge or refining the aesthetic approach, but, through culture, of profoundly transforming man's relationship with the media in which he exists, such as his working environment, his habitat or his natural environment, and in so doing of preserving liberty at a menacing moment in history, both for individual autonomy and for social harmony"[5].

Popular education militants, sociologists, a whole post — 1968 utopian movement proceeded to demonstrate how impossible it was for "cultivated culture" to really touch those who had not been initiated into it, and how debilitating the effects of "mass culture" could be; they wanted recognition of the legitimacy of autonomous cultural universes linked to particular social behaviour patterns and local solidarity. In the same spirit, the European Conference of Arc and Senans proposed to the ministers gathered in Helsinki in June 1972 a new orientation for cultural development policies, based on the following objectives:

- Substituting active creation for passive consumption;
- Making room for human responsibility where technical constraints prevail;
- Promoting a diversity of forms of cultural expression based on social pluralism, instead of merely seeking to extend the reach of inherited or elite culture;
- Giving priority to restoring the harmony between man and his environment[6].

This spirit is also to be found in the 7th Plan, which unlike its predecessors does not limit itself in the field of creation to advocating reforms in art teaching or proposing scattered or structural measures (such as extending social security coverage to artists, setting up a National Art Dissemination Office an a National Foundation for artistic creation, etc); instead it stresses cultural plurality and the intervention of creators in every aspect of daily life to resist the invasion of industrial production, advertising and organised leisure; it provides encouragement

3) Cf *La culture et le plan*, a note from the Research and Study Department of the Ministry of Culture, August 1982.

4) A 10th Plan covering the period 1989–93 is currently being prepared using methods which have not yet been divulged. It will be geared to integrating France into the single European market.

5) Cf *Developpement culturel*, No. 9, June 1971.

6) Cf *Developpement culturel*, No. 13, May–June 1972.

to amateurs and calls for less centralism, bureaucracy and partitioning at the government level.

With regard to cultural industries and the media, a certain distrust can be felt in the views expressed by various commissions. The report on the major options of the 6th Plan does say that "cultural development requires the skillful use of television and the products of cultural industries", but there is still a note of suspicion: "... whatever the quality of their products at present – it adds – in the way they represent the world, television and cultural industries forge the mentalities that make the civilisation of tomorrow. It is unthinkable to leave this power in the hands of public or private firms without the people, through those politically responsible for the nation's cultural development, having any real choice in the matter". This mistrust comes across even more clearly in the account contained in the 7th Plan of the impact of the audiovisual media on cultural life. Since television in France was a public service at the time, the exercise of control by the Minister was conceivable; it took the form of a Ministry of Culture and Communication set up between 1978 and 1981 and from 1986 onwards. **But it was particularly in the wording of the term of reference rather than through the exercise of direct ministerial authority that a certain amount of influence was wielded (without prejudice to the material produced spontaneously by the various channels).**

But the private sector cultural industries, which are very important in the daily lives of the French people, were not affected by the concrete measures taken by the authorities at the time.

The role of the Ministry

The proposals put forward in the different plans were drawn up on a pluralistic basis, but they were not neutral; they fitted into the cultural policy programme of the government they were intended for.

The role of the Ministry of Culture is decisive[7]. Within the budget allocated to it by the government it is the Ministry which draws up its concrete projects and general objectives. Generally speaking the Prime Minister does not seem to have been directly involved in the choice of projects. The exception was Jacques Chaban-Delmas, who in the early seventies showed great concern for the way in which his idea of a "New Society" could be put into practice through the projects of the Minister of Culture, Jacques Duhamel. The current Prime Minister, Jacques Chirac, has made statements on a few subjects in particular (the place of art teaching in schooling in general, the cultural heritage, the VAT rate on records).

When it is a matter of executing certain projects which require new expenditure, however, the President often sides with the minister responsible for cultural affairs. The natural enemy within the government of the Minister of Culture, whose interest lies in developing his activities, is the Minister of Finance, whose powerful department holds the purse strings. The Prime Minister often sides with the Minister of Finance, while the President of the Republic may support the Minister of Culture or look to him to present and take on projects in which he has a particular interest. Examples of this can be seen in the support De Gaulle gave Malraux in launching his Cultural Centres, in the way Jacques Duhamel followed up President Pompidou's wish to create a modern art centre in Paris (the future Centre Georges Pompidou or "Pompidou Centre"), in Jean-Philippe Lecat seeing through President Giscard d'Estaing's plans for the Orsay Museum, and in the projects shared by President Mitterrand and Minister Jack Lang which led not only to new "major construction works" but also to a marked increase in the overall cultural budget in 1981–82.

The role of parliament

Parliament, on the other hand, only plays a secondary role in drawing up cultural policy. Each year when the time comes to vote on the Finance Bill, Parliament learns of the projects of the Ministry of Culture, since the overall budget presentation is broken down into broad "programme" sections (national heritage, entertainment, cultural development, etc); within these broad spheres, tables show the expenditure for previous years in each sector, the number of people actively involved and the results obtained; there is then a note on the priority goals for the coming year and the means to be used to achieve them. Parliament can intervene at this stage, it is true; it is a tribune to which the Minister can clearly explain his policy and projects; in the ensuing debate he answers the written or oral questions the members put to him; a reporter summarises the proceedings. **But in view of the political structure of the Fifth Republic, this debate is purely for the form. No party wishes to be seen to oppose an increase in the cultural budget; but in giving its confidence to the government, the pro-government majority also accepts the fetters of the government's budget, approving policy outlines in a global package[8].**

Parliament has generally played a more important, more constructive role in producing legislation. The initial proposal comes from the Minister, but the National Assembly and the Senate can amend it to varying degrees insofar as the amendments remain compatible with the government's means and objectives. A good many laws have been the result of constructive work by Parliament: the laws on the protection and restoration of historic monuments (1962 and 1967), the law on protecting historic sites (1967), the law on donations and dations in payment of death duty (1968), the law on architecture (1977). In recent years Parliament has been very active in drawing up the law on book prices (1981) and especially the law on royalties (1985), resulting in texts which were eventually approved by a majority of far more members than actually support the government.

Those subjects most closely connected with general policy are those which sparked off the most impassioned debates, reflecting the subjects most present in the public eye. But because of the rift between majority and opposition, the work of Parliament only brings about minor amendments to the Minister's original text. This has always been the case, particularly with regard to the laws concerning radio and television (1974, 1982, 1986).

Other sources of inspiration of cultural policy

The Minister's background and personality

We have already mentioned that after the 6th Plan (1971–75) culture was only given a minor place in the Plans and the Plans themselves gradually became less important in the life of the nation.

The projects which Jack Lang defended from 1981 onwards remained faithful to the last Plans – and to Socialist Party programmes – only in the general spirit of their aims. They were often based on his personal experience (he directed an international theatre festival at Nancy and the Chaillot National Theatre), and on the direct contacts he established with personalities in the world of culture.

Specialised committees

He set up specialised committees to produce reports making a critical assessment of the situation in particular fields and providing a pool of ideas. The fields these reports covered included: books and reading, plastic art, films, television, cultural centres, scientific and technical creation, developing cultural activities in prisons. **They are, of course, coloured by the subjective views of those who helped write them, particularly when there was only one author involved, as was the case with the reports on regional and minority cultures, culture at the place of work and songs[9].**

7) The "French Model" in culture management was skillfully analysed by Augustin GIRARD, *The Ministry of Culture, in The Arts, Politics, Power and the Purse, An International Conference on the Structure of Arts Funding*, Arts Council of Great Britain, 1987, pp. 8–12.

8) *Le Monde* newspaper (17 November 1981) pointed out that after a month of debating at the National Assembly the state budget for 1988 as it was voted only differed very slightly from the budget drawn up by the Council of Ministers: a 0.046% increase in revenue and a 0.036% increase in expenditure; "the influence of MPs, says the article, is practically nil as regards how the government intends to collect and spend the taxpayers' money".

9) Cf. A. GIRARD, "Les evolutions de politiques culturelles en France" in *Méthodes pour l'evaluation des politiques culturelles nationales*, Stockholm 1987, pp 57–61.

More often than not these different documents were published and sold in bookshops; they fuelled public debate and gave rise to projects which may or may not have found favour with the Minister and his department. But there were no periodical or final appraisals of cost and results achieved.

Similarly, the government would have civil servants or working groups draw up reports and proposals which generally speaking were not intended for the public eye.

"The Research and Forecasting Department"

In 1963 a *Research and Study Service* was set up within the Ministry. It has since become the *Research and Forecasting Department*. This department sets up data banks of statistical, financial, economic, institutional, sociological and documentary matters; it carries out specific surveys and organises seminars and debates on cultural behaviour, public spending on culture, the effects of decentralisation, the cultural industries and so on. **These works obviously provide a useful basis for permanent reflection.** Some are public and others are reserved for the Minister and his various directorates; some are actually drawn up in answer to ministerial questions, but the department has only occasionally been asked and given the means to carry out systematic appraisals of results.

Jack Lang was also clearly concerned with keeping informed and he provided for more consultative procedures. But decisions continued to be taken as they always had been in cultural affairs: the French system has been said to be "a cultural monarchy", which means that after gathering information as and where he pleases, the Minister in office defines his options and takes his decisions in the fashion of a sovereign, according to the principles of "enlightened despotism", so to speak.

Note, however, that this in no way implies ministerial interference in artistic creation. The Ministry provides aid with creation, but it does not seek to influence the content, either through censorship or by issuing instructions.

Assessing the effectiveness of cultural policy measures

The Ministry of Culture anounces objectives and provides financial and other means of achieving them. *But how effectively does it assess its achievements?*

Since 1976 the cultural budget has been submitted to parliament in the form of "programme budgets", which provide elements for assessing objectives and results.

In the section of the 1987 Finance Bill concerning public reading, for example, the statement of the objective (" . . . enable all French people to read, for pleasure, culture, information or instruction") is followed by details of the component parts of this group of programmes, the aims of the different institutions (municipal libraries, central lending libraries, public information library at the Pompidou Centre), their importance, the role of the state since certain powers were transferred to the regions; this is followed by information on co-operation between libraries; the section concludes with a very general, very vague word about projects for 1987 ("the pursuit of trends introduced in 1986, namely: protection and promotion of the literary heritage, giving the underprivileged population groups easier access to reading, developing co-operation between libraries"). This report is followed by a series of figures: the means first of all, indicating the number of libraries of each type in 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1986, the number of state employees for the same years, the staff supplied by local authorities and associations, the number of vehicles. And secondly, results, showing the number of volumes restored, book loans, communes served, the number of people theoretically affected, places where books are deposited, buildings, furnished premises, progress with automation. *It should be noted that the columns relating to 1987 are left empty, which means that general objectives are not a basis for accurate forecasting.* There is, however, a table showing operating, payroll and investment costs for 1987 along with the corresponding figures for 1985 and 1986. A further table gives statistical data for 1981, 1982, 1983 and 1984 on plant and running costs for each type of institution, with the estimated expenditure per inhabitant, the percentage of state participation, the number of borrowers, the proportion of borrowers to total catchment population, the number of volumes loaned and the average per inhabitant. Finally, most of these data are presented in easy-to-read graphs with a recapitulation of developments since 1975.

The government department which presents these figures has therefore gathered a lot of information. Although some of the statistical series are too short (whenever possible trends should be studied in the long term), the facts and figures presented make a basis for assessment of a quality rarely found elsewhere. They do tend, however, to be presented in a rather crude form considering that they probably have to be digested in a hurry by non-specialist MPs; there is very little explanation (no special breakdown of readers, no attempt to correlate capital investments in a particular year with results achieved, no precise statement of objectives). The Research and Forecasting Department and the directorates involved could certainly improve the way they present their statistics and make them easier to interpret.

Specific questions requiring precise answers are brought up in parliamentary debate; the answers may provide fresh information specially collected for the occasion which could be highly useful for assessment purposes but which is rarely exploited other than for argument's sake in parliamentary debate.

All in all, therefore, examination of the Finance Bill only seems to give rise to a formal assessment of the results of an action when further credit is required in order to pursue and develop it. Many activities are a part of long-term projects which progress faster or slower from year to year according to the budgets available. It is hardly surprising, then, that the various directorates of the ministry find themselves competing with one another for any extra funds which may be available, to further their own interests, even if it is to the detriment of the others. Budget appropriations are determined by political considerations more than by assessment of real needs. Few governments have managed to devise really efficient assessment systems as yet; but they would do well to do so.

In France, the ministry nevertheless has its own very rigorous, highly efficient Research and Forecasting Department, which for a quarter of a century has collected statistics on every aspect of cultural life; amongst other things it carries on a permanent analysis of public spending on culture. Through major surveys it studies the cultural practices and attitudes of the population. It undertakes specific research at the request of the different directorates (it recently helped set up an "economic observatory on books", for example), it organises colloquies and debates with the various partners in cultural activities in certain sectors and takes care to present its work in clear, useful terms (in a series of bulletins published under the title "Développement culturel", for example).

Its works are used in various ways by the ministry's different directorates; perhaps they are even put to better use by university researchers and international thinkers than by the ministry itself.

The ministry has, however, stated its intention of using its assessment studies to better advantage in the future, particularly with regard to the uses to which public funds are put and budget appropriation procedures. It is indeed a good idea for it to make the most of available statistical studies in appraising its activities.

Comments by the panel of experts

An exceptional budgetary effort

What struck the panel of experts was first of all the extent of the budgetary effort in favour of cultural activities; since 1959 budget credits to culture have increased considerably. The sharp increase awarded in 1982, in the middle of an economic crisis, to a sector which usually takes third place behind economic and social considerations, was an exceptional feat in Europe, as is the fact that the budget has been maintained at that high level right up to the present, while many countries have undergone a recession.

The concern for direct management, standardisation and control

The size of the ministry's budget is explained by the fact that it is directly responsible for the management of large sectors, it controls numerous public establishments, it manages various institutions jointly with regional authorities at various levels and actually finances many associations itself. The model is based on historical traditions; it is no use comparing it with other models based on very different principles. The experts did wonder, however, whether the ministry was not being rather overactive in that it not only finances but also

organises, appoints staff to and runs a large number of institutions. This hierarchical approach to management, this concern for standardisation and control offer advantages, but do they not also waste energy and encourage bureaucratic behaviour?

Culture is less compatible than other fields with strict administrative hierarchies and too much central government control. We wonder whether the French authorities could give greater autonomy to the national museums and theatres, for example, for even when they have public company status they are still subject to close central government controls. In various other countries institutions of this type enjoy maximum independence and the results are positive. They are encouraged to develop their activities and take initiatives without the scientific or artistic quality of their productions suffering. One of the levels of decentralisation is the region. In studying the way the Ministry of Culture functions, the experts became convinced that many decisions currently taken at the central level could well be taken "in the field", particularly by the Ministry's Regional Directorates. In any event, it would seem that greater decentralisation of responsibilities and decision-making is required.

Original measures in favour of the cultural industries

The ministry no longer merely supports the non-profit sector – the patrimony, occupational training, artistic production – although this side of its activity is a major drain on its budget. Since 1981 it has also taken an active interest in the cultural industries through legislation and regulations. The experts noted the efficacy of the measures which have been taken over the years to foster film production and the extension of such aid to the audiovisual sector, and they were impressed by the originality of certain banking mechanisms in favour of the cultural industries.

Bringing in selective and conditional procedures

The present Minister has expressed his intention of reducing state intervention in various sectors and appealing as often as possible to private initiative. This has swiftly resulted in spectacular transformation of the "audiovisual landscape", with the privatisation of one of the public television channels and the introduction of two powerful commercial channels to compete with public television. But the ministry has also announced a cutdown on subsidies to associations, a revision of the development conventions with the various regional and local authorities to make them more selective, and also an appeal to private sponsorship. Tax incentives were introduced in 1982 and further developed in 1985 and 1987 by a "sponsorship development law" encouraging individuals and companies to support cultural initiatives. The panel of experts realise that this appeal to private sponsorship also has a symbolic, didactic purpose in making it clear that the state is not the only party responsible for culture; culture is the concern of all. They wonder whether the new joint financing procedure introduced in March 1987, whereby only those projects for which private funds have been raised are entitled to a state subsidy, will not jeopardise the chances of the more adventurous projects. It seems that public/private joint financing does not generate new resources; it can simply shift the onus from once source to another unless precise rules to the contrary are introduced, which is not the case at present. The experience of other countries with a long tradition of private sponsorship would also seem to suggest that more attention should be given to sponsorship by private individuals, which with the right sort of encouragement could prove a greater source of funding than company sponsorship.

Insufficient use of measuring instruments

Finally, at a time when the ministry wants not to cut down on investment but to redistribute its aid in line with private investment, there would seem to be a distinct need for serious assessment procedures.

Very few governments have managed thus far to develop satisfactory measuring instruments. France has made more progress in this direction than most countries. The information required to assess results already exists to a large extent, but it is not fully exploited as yet. Estimates are too often merely a matter of form, with no real concern for efficacy, for decisions on courses of action are usually determined by general government policy and tempered by resource availability. Ministry representatives assured the experts that they are aware of the need to improve their methods. In order to do so, they must improve co-operation and communication between the Ministry of Culture directorates and the Research and Forecasting Department, so that the latter's research is more directly related to the policies of the different ministry directorates and provides them with statistical and other information propitious to more rational decision making.

NEWS

The european film industry threatened by piracy of audiovisual works

The European film industry and with it a sizeable part of Europe's cultural heritage are seriously threatened by piracy of audiovisual works.

This was the worrying conclusion reached by 120 specialists at a Symposium on piracy of audiovisual works held at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg on 30 and 31 May 1988.

The huge sums of money misappropriated in this way are difficult to quantify (though estimated at $ 1.5 billion in a single year for American films throughout the world) and entail a corresponding diminution of the remuneration received by authors for their creative work.

Piracy, which may be regarded as theft, is thus a factor in the decline of the film industry and increases unemployment in it (in the Federal Republic of Germany alone 50,000 jobs were lost in this sector in 1985).

The participants also laid great stress on the fact that piracy of audiovisual works consisted not only in infringements of reproduction rights (unauthorised copies) but also in the manifold forms of unauthorised public performance (showings in all kinds of public places, unauthorised broadcasting and transmitting).

This Council of Europe Symposium was one of the activities on the joint Council of Europe/European Communities programme for European Cinema and Television Year (ECTVY 88). It reviewed the situation as regards piracy in European countries and the steps taken to combat it. In this connection it emphasised the importance of:

- reinforcing criminal law
- enhancing awareness among the authorities responsible for investigation and punishment and among the general public
- co-operation between European countries

The participants fully approved the Recommendation R(88)2 recently adopted by the Council of Europe to combat the piracy of audiovisual works and hoped that it would be most applied with the utmost stringency.

The full text of the Symposium's conclusions is available on request from the Council of Europe's Press Department.

Artistic dimension of the artists' Europe

A meeting between Western and Eastern European painters Strasbourg, 26 and 27 May 1988

Under the patronage of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, the Council for Cultural Cooperation has brought together for the first time in Strasbourg representatives of the plastic arts from European countries. In addition to artists from the Council of Europe member states, the meeting was attended by Poland, S.S.R. of Ukraine, Yugoslavia, S.S.R. of Bielorussia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, USSR, Hungary, GDR.

They decided to organise in 1989 a vast travelling exhibition of the work of 300 artists on the theme of: "Cultural identity and Future – Europe through artist eyes – Tradition and Modernity"

Following its inauguration at UNESCO, Paris, in June 1989 and after being staged in Strasbourg as part of the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Council of Europe, it will be the occasion, in each of the towns where it is staged, for several encounters of artists from the West and the East (music, drama, the cinema, literature, photograhy and architecture) and for numerous colloquies.

A cultural network for Europe: A Council of Europe initiative

Hosted by the Council of Europe, the *Association des Centres Culturels de Rencontre* and the *Fondation Claude-Nicolas Ledoux*, the representatives of some sixty cultural centres from eighteen European countries and other organisations running cultural activities met recently at Arc-et-Senans (France, May 1988). This was a first meeting of this kind to discuss the shaping of a Europe-wide cultural network which in a near future could become a decisive instrument for cultural cooperation.

Some of the decisions taken concern: the exchange and circulation of cultural events and schemes; the coproduction of original cultural projects and the provision for suitable training courses.

The network will be mainly based on centres of any size as long as their historic or contemporary premises can be used as reception and meeting places. They will be expected to produce or encourage a wide variety of cultural expressions. It is also taken for granted that these centres enjoy a certain freedom of decision.

Several schemes were announced for setting-up new networks or strengthening existing ones on either a geographical basis (network of Mediterranean centres, network of Nordic centres, network of maritime centres, etc) or a thematic basis (network of residential centres, network concerned with scientific and technical culture, network of literary translation centres, prehistory, art and technology, "Transeuropphalles").

First priority is at the time being to promote information and communication between centres and to this effect to produce this year a *guide* to cultural centres and networks in Europe. Bilingual (French and English) news items will in future be included in each Centre's bulletin. Moreover, an effort will be made to announce the contents of each centre's programme two or three years in advance so as to facilitate exchanges, coordinated action or coproductions.

Other schemes include the development of European cultural routes on the basis of networks and more frequent exchanges of artists, writers thanks mainly to the facilities provided by the network of residential centres.

Another meeting is to be held in Berlin, the 1988 European City of Culture, in order to present the venture's aims and initial results to the public.

Communications in the 1990s

The tenth International *IDATE* (Institut de l'Audiovisuel et des Télécommunications en Europe) Conference will take place in Montpellier from 16 to 18 November 1988 and will be devoted mainly to the theme of prospects for the future.

This Conference will cover broadest range of communication techniques and stimulate discussion by bringing together an audience from different and very varied spheres: audiovisual and computer specialists, telecommunications; representatives of local, national and international institutions; users and consumers of communication 'products'; researchers, analysts and experts working in this field.

The theme of the "Nineties" is imperative today, as not only European but a worldwide tendency in public and private organisations is attempting to determine the major orientations and issues which in all probability will shape the last years of our century.

The call for papers for the international IDATE Conference is organised around four major poles:

- 1992: states and communications
- network intelligence
- towards a confrontation between techniques and application
- scenarios for the year 2000.

These subject matters will be developed through economic, legal, sociological and political approaches.

For further information please apply to IDATE – J.II 1988, Bureaux du Polygone, 34000 Montpellier, tel. 33.67.65.48.48, fax 33/67.65.57.19, telex 490.290 F.

A draft TV convention

The Council of Europe experts reached an agreement

A draft European Convention on transfrontier TV broadcasting has been agreed in Strasbourg by the Council of Europe's Steering Committee on the Mass Media.

The purpose of the draft convention is to establish ground rules for television transmissions across national frontiers.

The main provisions cover:

- freedom of expression, reception and retransmission;
- advertising time, advertising breaks and advertising for particular products;
- pornography, violence, incitement to racial hatred, etc. and youth protection;
- sponsorship;
- the screening of a reasonable proportion of audio-visual works of European origin;
- conciliation and arbitration procedures to deal with alleged violations of the Convention.

The text of the draft Convention will now go to the Council's Committee of Ministers and will be published once formally adopted.

The decision to draw up a Council of Europe Convention on TV Broadcasting was taken at the first ever conference of European Mass Media Ministers in Vienna in December 1986.

The Council, the Ministers said, with its broad membership, and its commitment to human rights and European cultural values, is the most appropriate institution for shaping a European audio-visual area and implementing a coherent mass media policy.

Mass Media Ministers from the 21 Council of Europe countries plus Finland and the Holy See, will hold their second Conference in Stockholm in November 1988.

Editor: Director of Education, Culture and Sport, Council of Europe, 67006 Strasbourg-Cedex, France.